



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

into coöperation with that influential royalist and nationalist movement represented by such writers as Charles Maurras, Leon Daudet, Jules Lemaître, and Paul Bourget. Sorel's latest writings, being chiefly journalistic, are much less accessible than those of his earlier periods; and it is to be regretted that Mr. Cheydeleur has not given us more full and precise details of this concluding phase of that "evolution of doctrines" which his book traces.

A. O. LOVEJOY.

Johns Hopkins University.

Seventeenth Century French Readings, edited with notes by ALBERT SCHINZ and HELEN MAXWELL KING. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1915. 12mo., xiv + 382 pp.

Professor Schinz and Miss King have stated in the Preface the object of their book: "This book aims at providing, for the study of the French literature of the seventeenth century, a greater variety of texts than are now easily accessible." The method followed may be summarized as follows: (1) To include fewer authors, and allow more material under each name, rather than to include all the notable authors of the period; (2) To omit Corneille, Racine and Molière; (3) To include all authors of great importance of whom there exist no easily accessible editions; (4) In selecting texts, "to emphasize strongly that these are not *our* selections; . . . they are simply those sanctioned by a sort of tacit vote cast by the intellectual élite of past generations"; (5) To give "few notes—historical mainly—and with such preliminary comments only as are necessary to direct the student's thoughts along the proper lines"; (6) In arranging material, to disregard the chronological order, and to adopt the following arbitrary one: "L'École de Malherbe et les épigones du XVI^e siècle"; Ch. 1, L'Hôtel de Rambouillet; Ch. 2, L'Académie Française; Ch. 3, Boileau; Ch. 4, Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes; Ch. 5, La Fontaine; Ch. 6, Descartes; Ch. 7, Pascal; Ch. 8, Bossuet; Ch. 9, Fénelon; Ch. 10, Les Moralistes; Ch. 11, Trois Femmes Écrivains; (7) "To give only complete passages, but in some cases we have deemed it necessary to forego our own rule."

There can be no question of the editors' statement: "That [the seventeenth] century is indisputably the fundamental age of French

literature." Consequently their aim to provide "a greater variety of texts than are now easily accessible" is praiseworthy. There is room for another collection alongside of Warren's text-book, from which the present work differs in two respects: in giving many more authors, and in including verse as well as prose. In determining how well the editors have carried out their task, we may consider in order the points of their preface.

(1) The editors' decision "to include fewer authors, and allow more under each name," is too obviously wise to require any argument. One may ask, however, if it would not have been desirable to extend this principle by excluding a few of the writers now included, *e. g.*, Mme de Maintenon and some of the extremely minor authors of Ch. 1. (2) Equally wise was the decision to omit the dramatists—these texts are already abundantly provided and do not easily lend themselves to abridgment. (3) The editors may fairly claim to have "included all authors of *great* [italics mine] importance of whom there exist no easily accessible editions." But some of those omitted are at least as important as some of those included. The most noteworthy omissions are in the fields of memoirs and the novel. Even if "Retz . . . required too much historical knowledge of the times to be made enjoyable," Saint-Simon (not even mentioned) should by all means have been represented, for few authors of the period are more interesting to the student. The intelligent and witty Saint-Évremond, also ignored, ought certainly to be included under some heading.—Parenthetically, the important *libertin* current of thought, of which Saint-Évremond is one representative, is entirely neglected save in perhaps two lines from Théophile de Viau.—The novel is represented only by passages from the rather pallid *Princesse de Clèves* and the tiresome *Télémaque*. Selections from the *Astrée* or *Cyrus* might well have supplemented the scanty representation of the pastoral contained in the verse selections. If space allowed, passages from *Le page disgracié* or *Le roman bourgeois* would have proved interesting.—But the editor of every such collection has to steer between the Scylla of neglecting some authors and the Charybdis of producing a "scrappy" book. On the whole, our editors are to be congratulated on their choice of authors, and especially on the inclusion of certain minor writers, such as Régnier, Théophile, Vaugelas and Perrault, really essential if one would comprehend the development of the literature of the century. (4) While the editor

—and the reviewer—of an anthology must of course be largely guided in the choice of texts by the consensus of critical opinion of the past, it does not necessarily follow that one should abdicate all right to critical judgment himself. At the risk of running counter to Boileau and the “intellectual élite of past generations,” the reviewer will point out some instances in which it seems to him that the selections might have been better. Some regrettable omissions have been already noted. On the other hand, Mme de Maintenon, some of the *précieux* (abundantly represented in Crane’s *Société française au XVII^e siècle*), part of La Fontaine (“easily accessible” in several American editions), and Boileau’s *Passage du Rhin* might well go by the board. So too some of *Télémaque*, if its place were taken by parts of the interesting *Lettre à l’Académie*. In the apportionment of space, always a delicate point, there are some observations to make. The Hôtel de Rambouillet and the *précieux* are given over one-eighth of the text. Boileau has 34 pages, more than La Rochefoucauld and La Bruyère combined. Pascal has fewer pages than Descartes, though his literary value is far greater. Per-rault has more than twice as many pages as La Rochefoucauld, who is probably the least adequately represented of the really important authors. He is allowed but 9 pages, and more than one-third of these are the relatively unimportant *Portrait* of himself. Even Mme de Maintenon is given much more space than he! It is difficult to see what principle guided the editors in this important point. (5) The paucity of notes and critical interpretation, while avowedly intentional, strikes the present reviewer as the most serious defect of the book. The notes are too scanty, and not a few are inaccurate. Moreover, they are unwisely put in French. Why the notes, meant to help the student, should be in French, while the Preface, meant to help teachers, should be in English, is indeed a puzzle. Among the inaccuracies in the notes are the following. P. 25, n. 1; Mme de Rambouillet was only half “Italienne.” Pp. 44 and 98; the editors accept “Somaize” without question; cf. J. Warshaw, “The Identity of Somaize,” in *M. L. N.*, Feb. and March, 1914. P. 47, fine print, l. 11; the date “1909” in connection with V. Cousin is misleading. P. 67, fine print; the “sonnet de Benserade” is a sonnet by courtesy only. P. 71, n. 3; “électeurs” were not “dignitaires diplomatiques.” P. 82, n. 2; Barbin’s shop was not “en face du Palais de Justice,” but in it. P. 99, n. 2; “Quinault, auteur de dix-sept tragédies, attaquées vio-

lemment par le critique Zoïle." What is meant by this note must be left to the imagination of the reader. P. 133, n. 1; According to Larousse, barracks in France date from the 16th century, and their use became general under Louis XIV. P. 142, n. 1; The explanation of the expression: "il ferait que sage" is not "Il ferait ce qui serait sage" but rather "Il ferait ce que ferait un sage." Cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I, pp. 11-12. P. 238, fine print, l. 2; Charles I was not "condamné à mort par Cromwell," nor (*ib.*, l. 9) was Henriette d'Angleterre "extrêmement belle." P. 314, n. 2; La Bruyère passed only the last twelve years of his life, not "la plus grande partie," at Chantilly. P. 319, n. 1; The "honnête homme" of the seventeenth century can not be well defined in a few words; but "honnête" commonly connoted moral qualities or social polish rather than "culture intellectuelle." P. 320, n. 1; It is not accurate to say that Henri IV "devint roi de France en renonçant au protestantisme." P. 326, n. 1; The note entirely misses the point of La Bruyère's epigram, which is directed rather against adults than against children. P. 328, n. 1; The last part of the note is worse than useless. Think of citing *La tulipe noire* as "littérature" in connection with La Bruyère! P. 370, n. 2; This should have been given under n. 2 on p. 365. P. 92, l. 15; It should be explained that "Tholus" (Dutch "Toll-Huys," *i. e.*, "toll-house"), magnified by contemporary adulators of Louis XIV into a fortress, was really only a slightly fortified custom-house. P. 274, n. 2; The student should be told who "M. de Condom" was.—Notes on the numerous terms of mythology—Atropos, Acheron, etc.—ought not to be necessary, but unfortunately are today.

With the above exceptions, the notes are in general satisfactory. The notes on the language should be far more numerous, the more so as the book, very properly, has no vocabulary. The editors would have done well to bear in mind what M. Lanson has said of seventeenth century French: "les mots qu'on entend du premier coup, qui sont familiers à première vue, ont eu souvent des sens et des emplois qui diffèrent de leurs sens et de leurs emplois actuels par des nuances fines et presque imperceptibles." (*Conseils sur l'art d'écrire*, p. 245). These *nuances* constitute many pitfalls for the student and even for the teacher; obsolete words also cause trouble.¹

¹ Among the places where the student will find no help in the notes, are the following. P. 12, l. 9, pour ce que. P. 14, l. 21, impiteux. P. 16, l. 10,

In the matter of literary criticism, the editors throw almost the entire burden upon the teacher. They give no bibliography; they even advise (p. iv, n. 1) against the use of French histories of literature. This book will be used by college students in their second or third year, when they should be mature enough to begin to utilize the excellent French manuals. Histories of French literature in English, especially Wright's *History of French Literature*, might also have well been mentioned. The editors profess to give only "such preliminary comments as are necessary to direct the student's thoughts along the proper lines." (P. iv). Even here they are not consistent. Generally there is not a word of comment. Sometimes—for instance, on Pascal—there is critical comment that is good as far as it goes. But the prefatory note on the *Pensées* does not even mention the prophecies or the fall of man, the two corner-stones of the work. Space that might be devoted to criticism is given up to unimportant gossip or "portraits," as for Mme de La Fayette and Mme de Sévigné. The critical apparatus is as a whole haphazard and jejune. The book would have been far more valuable if a pithy critique were prefixed to the selections from each author, and a brief bibliography appended. (6) In arranging their material, the editors have disregarded the simplest and most natural order, the chronological (which they say "means chaos"). It is open to question whether the plan

ressentiments. P. 46, l. 16, alcôves. P. 62, l. 23, vingt-six fois (modern "trente-six"). P. 64, l. 24, partement. P. 153, l. 11, aussi (non plus). P. 154, l. 1, lier. P. 193, l. 20, prudence (sagesse). P. 211, l. 7, s'en tirer (s'en arracher). P. 217, l. 21, morale positive. (Cf. théologie positive). P. 225, l. 21, chats fourrés. P. 225, l. 27, authentique (imposante, solennelle). P. 235, l. 25, comédie. P. 244, l. 16, Madame. P. 314, l. 18, coquins (mendiants). P. 319, l. 9, imagination (fantaisie). P. 324, l. 20, prévenu. P. 360, l. 16, médiocrité. P. 360, l. 23, rendue (convaincue). P. 371, l. 12, petite (faible). P. 371, l. 22, *Sagesse*. In a few cases, the explanations are not correct. P. 27, n. 2, plancher is not restricted entirely to the meaning "floor" today; cf. "sauter au plancher." P. 77, n. 1, Si = "pourtant," not "ainsi." P. 88, n. 2, Fiction does not = "imagination." P. 143, n. 1, hoquet = "choc," not "obstacle." In a good many cases, necessary notes on constructions or forms are missing. P. 19, l. 3, dessus (prep.). P. 19, l. 17, eut sa vie expirée. P. 25, l. 14, devant (avant). P. 25, l. 16, une fois autant de (deux fois plus de). P. 27, l. 9, Luxembourg (le L.). P. 43, l. 17, devant que (avant que). P. 96, l. 1, à vous à qui. P. 171, l. 17, s'étaient pu glisser. P. 233, l. 25, ôte de blâme. P. 310, l. 6, moins (le moins). P. 313, l. 24, vale (vaille). P. 318, l. 4, soi (lui).

followed is any less chaotic. The "Révoltés contre Malherbe" precede the "Disciples de Malherbe." The selections from Boileau are given under two headings. The "Querelle des anciens et des modernes," an affair of the end of the century, is put in an early chapter. Descartes, who for every reason should be in one of the first chapters, is found only in Ch. VI, after La Fontaine, who is distinctly an author of the second half of the century. For no conceivable reason, La Bruyère precedes La Rochefoucauld, and Fénelon both of them. (7) The editors' principle of giving only complete passages, but of foregoing this rule when necessary, is undoubtedly the method most likely to avoid scrappiness on the one hand and tedium on the other. Opinions will differ as to what should be omitted. Thus, in Malherbe's *Consolation à M. du Périer*, the omission of some of the lines full of mythological allusions seems to the present reviewer good judgment, the omission of the stanza beginning "Non qu'il ne me soit grief," bad judgment. More of Rénier's admirable *Satire IX* would have been welcome. Boileau's *Art poétique* is cut too much, some of the most important passages being omitted, *e. g.* Chant III, ll. 1-8, 93-102, 359-372, 391-428. Descartes' *Discours* is in general well abridged, but at least two very important passages are omitted, one in the II^e Partie, beginning "pour toutes les opinions que j'avais reçues," one in the III^e Partie, beginning "notre volonté ne se portant." Some of the finest of Pascal's *Pensées* are not given, *e. g.* end of Art. I, 1; Art. IV, 7; Art. VI, 50; Art. VII, 9; the last part of Art. IX, 1; Art. XXII, 3; *ib.*, 58; Art. XXV, 17 *bis*. In the case of anything so logically planned as Bossuet's funeral orations, it would probably have been preferable to give one oration entire rather than parts of two. All things considered, however, the editors have handled well this difficult and delicate task of excision.

The book seems to have comparatively few misprints.²

² The following are the only important ones noted. P. 9, l. 9; comma missing at end. P. 44, l. 13; *gue*, read *que*. P. 82, l. 20 either the comma after *toujours* or all three commas were better omitted. Cf. note in Brunetière's edition, Hachette. The editors nowhere state what texts they follow. P. 258, fine print, l. 7; *Philippe V*, read *Philippe IV*. P. 259, fine print, l. 11; *Philippe VI*, read *Philippe IV*. P. 284, fine print, l. 10; *ses fastes*, read *son faste*. P. 315, l. 20; *annobli*; read *anobli* or *ennobli*. (La Bruyère wrote *annobli*, but as the editors have wisely modernized the spelling elsewhere, *annobli* should be changed). P. 334, l. 1; *frisés*; read *frisés*. P. 356, title and fine print, l. 1; *Demoiselle*; read *Mademoiselle*.

From the comments above, it is evident that the book under review falls short of perfection in some important points. It is to be regretted that Professor Schinz has not thought it worth while to devote the undoubted resources of his scholarship to producing a book that should be thoroughly good, instead of merely good. But whatever its sins of omission, the "Seventeenth Century French Readings" makes available for class use a lot of excellent material. It deserves to be widely introduced in colleges and doubtless will be.

GEORGE N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

CORRESPONDENCE

A SENTENCE FROM AN ENGLISH NOTEBOOK OF VOLTAIRE'S

In the *English Review*, February, 1914, there appeared under the title, "An English Notebook of Voltaire," several pages of hitherto unpublished notes which Voltaire evidently jotted down, in part at least, during the early months of his stay in England, in 1726.¹ These notes were discovered in Petrograd and published by Fernand Caussy, a scholar well known for his interest in Voltaire, although without his name and with almost no comment. They contain material which is of interest in various connections. The English is curious but for the most part intelligible.

One entry, in particular, is significant in that it seems to touch upon a point in Voltaire's biography of which almost nothing is known and which has been considerably discussed. The sentence in question reads: "Thirty and one of july one thousand seven hundred twenty and six, I saw floating islands nyer(near) Saint Om . . ." ² There can be little doubt that Saint Om . . . is Saint Omer, a town in northern France, the capital of the department of Pas-de-Calais, northwest of Lille and on the road to Calais. The town lies on the river Aa. From that point on, the river is canalized. Haut Pont, an outlying district of Saint Omer, is inhabited by people of Flemish origin who preserve the Flemish language and curious old customs. The ground cultivated by these people

¹ *English Review*, 1914, pp. 313 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 315.